

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed May 13, 2008 the Office noted that claims 11-20 were pending and rejected claims 11-20. Claims 11, 12 and 20 have been amended, no claims have been canceled, claim 21 has been added, and, thus, in view of the foregoing claims 11-21 remain pending for reconsideration which is requested. No new matter has been added. The Office's rejections are traversed below.

FORMALITIES

The Applicants wishes to bring to the attention of the Office that the Attorney Docket No. in this matter has been changed to 0600-1180. We respectfully request your records be updated accordingly.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 11 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office asserts that the language of the claim make it unclear an indefinite.

The Applicants have amended the claim to make it better understood by the Office.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 11-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Cho, KR-2002019806. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument and amendment.

Cho discusses a Digital Rights Management architecture converting service which specifies the right to use digital content.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite "[a] system for accessing, at a consultation station, information associated with rights to use said information, the use rights being expressed in a particular rights expression language ... a use rights adaptation unit including means for receiving use rights data associated with the information to be accessed; and means for analyzing said use rights data to determine said particular rights expression language in which said use rights associated with said information are expressed, the user rights adaptation unit being associated with means for determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station, and further including means for comparing the said particular rights expression language with the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station to determine if said particular right expression language is recognized by said recovery means" Support for the amendment may be found, for

example, page 5, lines 27-30; page 6, lines 19-25; and page 7, lines 23-27. Claim 20 has been amended in a manner substantially similar to claim 11. The Applicants submit that no new matter has been added by the amendments of claims 11 and 20.

Cho fails disclose a use rights adaptation unit receiving use rights data associated with information to be accessed by a consultation station and the use rights adaptation unit analysing the received use rights data to determine the rights expression language in which it is expressed, and determining whether conversion should take by comparing the user rights expression language with the language expression recognised at the consultation station.

Instead, Cho discusses whether or not the client platform can support the user rights expression language is determined at the client platform by the user. The user only sends a request from the client platform for conversion to a conversion unit if the language is not supported. Thus no comparison takes place at the conversion server to determine if conversion should take place.

Moreover, the conversion server as discussed in Cho does not analyse the user rights data to determine the rights expression language. Instead, as discussed in Cho, the client must intervene, and, by means of an information screen, select and input digital rights management information for both original contents and converting contents and execute a conversion request

to the conversion server. Conversion at the conversion server is then carried out according to the user's request.

For at least the reasons discussed above, amended claim 1 and 20 are not disclosed by Cho.

Cho fails to disclose "the use rights adaptation unit includes said means for determining the one or more rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means of said consultation station and wherein said means for determining the one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means comprises means for remotely interrogating the recovery means," as in amended claim 12.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cho in view of Nutall, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0004895. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an argument.

Nutall adds nothing to the deficiencies of Cho as applied against amended claim 1. Therefore, Cho and Nutall, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 18.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Cho in view of Bormans. The Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse the rejection with an

argument.

Bormans adds noting to the deficiencies of Cho as applied against amended claim 1. Therefore, Cho and Bormans, taken separately or in combination, fail to render obvious the features of claim 19.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

NEW CLAIM

Claim 21 is new. Support for claim 21, may be found for example, in Fig. 1, consultation station 4, amended claims 1 and 20. The prior art of record fails to disclose a consultation station adapted to consult information associated with rights to use said information, the use rights being expressed in a particular language, including use rights recovery means adapted to recognize use rights expressed in one or more different languages in order to access said information, which consultation station includes means for declaring a list of one or more use rights expression languages recognized by said recovery means, to a use rights adaptation unit in order to receive from the said rights adaptation unit converted use rights associated with said information, the conversion being done according to one of the rights expression language of the transmitted list.


SUMMARY

It is submitted that the claims satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§ 112, 102 and 103. It is also submitted that claims 11-21 continue to be allowable. It is further submitted that the claims are not taught, disclosed or suggested by the prior art. The claims are therefore in a condition suitable for allowance. An early Notice of Allowance is requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 25-0120 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON



James J. Livingston, Jr.
Reg. No. 55,394
209 Madison St, Suite 500
Alexandria, VA 22314
Telephone (703) 521-2297
Telefax (703) 685-0573
(703) 979-4709

JJL/fb